



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the various sessions. Most noticeable were three *Festschriften* composed for the occasion: *Neuphilologische Beiträge herausgegeben vom Verein für neuere Sprachen in Hannover, Beiträge zur Geschichte der romanischen Philologie in Deutschland* by Prof. E. Stengel, and *Die Aussprache des Englischen nach den deutsch-englischen Grammatiken vor 1750* by Prof. W. Vietor.

The arrangements for the convention were admirable and the programme varied. The sessions, consuming three days, were held in the hall of the old *Rathhaus*, dating from the fifteenth century, but recently restored with considerable costly elaboration. Convivial gatherings were interspersed, including a welcome the first evening, a joint breakfast, a festal banquet, a *Kommers*, the *Bierzeitung* of which contained productions in Latin, Anglo-Saxon, Old French and Middle High German, a joint dinner including ladies, at which the Modern Language Association of America was cordially greeted and well toasted, and a final *Früh-schoppen*. The sights of the city were also thoroughly inspected, and by special permission of the emperor a complimentary performance of Shakspeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream* at the royal theatre was tendered to the members of the association.

Among those present at the convention were Dr. Ahn, son of the well-known grammarian, Dr. Ey of Hanover, to whose efforts the conception and completion of the whole undertaking were largely due, Prof. van Hamel of Groningen, Holland, who received with the writer the compliment of an election to the society, Dr. Klinghardt of Reichenbach and Prof. Kölbing of Breslau, editors of the *Englische Studien*, Prof. Körting of Münster, Prof. Koschwitz of Greifswald, Dr. Krummacher of Cassel, grandson of the fabulist, Prof. Sachs, editor of the great dictionary which bears his name, Prof. Stengel of Marburg, Prof. Trautmann of Bonn, Prof. Wülcker of Leipzig and Prof. Zupitza of Berlin. The *Verband* numbers already upwards of 300 members, and the permanent success of the organization is already assured. The next regular annual meeting will be held in May 1887, at Frankfort on the Main.

H. S. WHITE,

Hanover, Germany.

(Cornell University).

WILHELM SCHERER.

Stirbt mein Vater dereinst, der graue, reisige Nestor,
Wer beklagt ihn alsdann? Und selbst von dem Auge des
Sohnes

Wälzet die Thräne sich kaum, die gelinde. Völlig vollendet
Liegt der ruhende Greis, der Sterblichen herrliches Muster.
Aber der Jüngling fallend erregt *unendliche Sehnsucht*
Allen Künftigen auf und jedem stirbt er aufs neue,
Der die rühmliche That mit rühmlichen Thaten gekrönt
wünscht.

Who could have foreseen that Scherer should have described most effectively the impression caused by his own early death, when he closed his masterly representation of Schiller's heroic career with the verses of Goethe's "Achilleis" just quoted? And Scherer is mourned not only by the students of Germanic philology, but also by the educated of the whole German nation, which has lost in him one of its most gifted sons, one of its most faithful and enthusiastic interpreters.

It cannot be the object of these lines to present a biographical sketch of Scherer; a few data, however, will serve to describe his life, which, like that of many German scholars, was comparatively uneventful. It represents, nevertheless, a series of successes from the time when together with his teacher, Müllenhoff, he appeared as the joint editor of the *Denkmäler*, until, after having achieved the highest positions and honors, he died as one of the acknowledged leaders of his chosen science. Born and educated in Austria, he proceeded a young student of brilliant qualities to the University of Berlin, where Haupt and Müllenhoff, the representatives of Lachmann's exact school, determined his philological character. It is interesting and noteworthy that he had friendly relations also with Jacob Grimm, the patriarch of German philology. Scarcely twenty-five years of age, he was called to succeed his former teacher, Franz Pfeiffer, at the University of Vienna. With the re-establishment of the University of Strassburg, he was selected to become professor of German philology there, and from thence he was finally called to Berlin, where, after the death of Müllenhoff, he was the sole occupant of the same chair in Germany's greatest seat of learning. In all these different positions he gathered about him a number of enthusiastic pupils, many of whom are now teaching at

German universities. More interesting, perhaps, than so bare an outline as that given above, will be an attempted picture of Scherer as he appears in his writings, a picture of his relations to his predecessors and of his influence upon contemporary science.

Scherer was not, like so many others of his profession, a scholar of the class who laboriously accumulate treasures of knowledge and store them up in portly volumes soon to be forgotten, either secluding themselves from the contemporaneous world, or else passing their lives in making savage attacks upon the opponents of their own profitless opinions. Although none of his many adversaries could ever accuse him of superficiality or lack of philological accuracy, his mind was too broad to occupy itself exclusively with a single branch of science, or to exhaust itself in mere grammatical formalism. A Genius of extreme scientific productivity and many-sidedness, he forms a conspicuous and happy contrast to those sterile representatives of German philology who, being themselves intellectual eunuchs, can never engender a spirit of scientific activity among their students.

There is something grand and heroic in Scherer's nature, and in his manner of approaching and grappling with the problems of his science. That spirit which had brought German philology into deepest union with the whole national and intellectual development of Germany, which had inspired Herder, the Grimms, Uhland and their followers, seemed also to rest upon Scherer. But a careful observation and comparison will easily discover differences which constitute Scherer's independence and originality. Both views and methods of the older generation of German philologists were the fruit of a development which had its roots in the Eighteenth century, which had produced the classical period of German poetry and philosophy, and had found its highest aim in the re-establishment of the true German spirit. Scherer, far from regarding with disdain the work of his predecessors, and not vain enough, like some of his contemporaries, to believe himself to be the true philological Messiah, rather took possession of that rich inheritance which was left to him. But he did not conceal from himself its weak-

nesses, its subjective illusions, its almost child-like love for systems. And it was due to Scherer's liberal mind, his intuitive understanding of the hidden tendency of the *Zeitgeist*, his willingness to follow it and to remain in mutual intercourse with it, that he undertook to open new channels for the development of philological studies.

Even a superficial perusal of the second chapter of his *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache* will disclose the fact, that it was the overwhelming influence of the natural sciences to which he yielded; that it was their methods which by their marvellous practical successes, had revolutionized the mental life of the nation, that he strove to apply to his own science.

It was the time when vulgar materialism was celebrating its bacchanals over the fact that the human soul could not be discovered by means of the dissecting knife and microscope, when philosophy and all the mental sciences seemed to be buried forever, only occasionally, perhaps, to be exhumed and gazed at like mummies of a by-gone age. To-day we are astonished to contemplate how young Scherer preserved his moderation, firmly upholding the standard of the mental sciences, although even later enthusiastically confessing in his essay *Die neue Generation (Aufsätze zur Geschichte des geistigen Lebens in Deutschland)* that he is chained to the triumphal car of the natural sciences.

Who will deny that a reform in the methods and general treatment of the mental sciences was necessary, and that this reform necessarily had to come from the natural sciences? The principal methods adopted by Scherer, the exact investigation of facts, the inquiry into the physiological nature of language, the comparison of phenomena have borne rich fruits, and may be traced in all of the neo-grammatical work. But who, again, will deny that this movement is gradually assuming the arrogant character of Schelling's philosophy, who, on the contrary, scorning the investigation of facts, pretended to be able to construct and determine the laws of nature within his own mind? If it only depends upon discovering the right method, in order to succeed in unveiling all the mysteries which surround the origin of language, and the activity of the *Sprachgeist* in

creating the different linguistic formations, why not at once set about finding a universal patent method? A mere glance at the rank growth of methodological literature would almost convince one that this was really intended, and every new attempt is greeted by the applause of those scientific sciolists who rejoice over the fact that they are in no need of genius to solve the deepest problems. In the mean time, however, the question as to the soundness of the principles which lie at the basis of this whole movement is not at all settled. We freely concede that, without accepting the principle of causality, scientific work is simply impossible. But there are grave doubts whether the idea of causality, accepted by the scientist, will suffice for the investigation of language, which is not only a physical, but also a psychical product. This psychical factor is mainly that inner experience, including the rich field of emotional and mental activity, that inner life, which withdraws itself from mere mechanical and external causality. There have been but few attempts to fix the laws upon which the methods of research in this field can be based, and we can fully understand how linguistic investigators refused to make use of a means which had led to great delusions and errors in previous times. Scientific progress, however, as well as the materialistic one-sidedness of present methods, demands a closer inquiry into the psychical factor of linguistic and literary phenomena; and until we have that, it would be well to be more cautious.

It is not Scherer's fault, if some of his new theories and methods, partly anticipated by Schleicher, were carried to extremes which he himself would never have sanctioned. Possessing the courage to expose himself to the risk of making mistakes in order to subserve the final discovery of truth, his was a constantly progressive nature. Time and again he ventures to stimulate investigation by advancing bold hypotheses, by giving expression to paradoxical opinions or by demarcating new fields of inquiry. This was frequently the case even in his earliest successful publication, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*. Rare pleasure may be derived from a perusal of his many reviews in different scientific journals,

where the reader, being brought into a more personal contact with the author, will be astonished at the versatility of his mind, at a wealth of ideas, suggestions and sound judgments, which may be said to have covered almost all branches of German philology.

But in the midst of detailed and minute investigations, apparently conducted purely in the interests of science, Scherer never lost sight of the final aim of all his labor, which was to advance the knowledge and promote the development of the German nation. How beautifully has he stated this ideal of his life in the dedication of his first work to Karl Müllenhoff, and how heroically at last did he sacrifice his life to this grand purpose! While narrow-minded colleagues could never forgive him for thus maintaining the closest connection with the national life, he completely won the hearts of the great body of his compatriots, who willingly listened to him as their honored teacher and friend.

Easily may we discover, in this respect also, his relation to his great predecessors. From its beginnings, German philology had been the guardian and promoter of the German national idea and all the early researches into German antiquity were made with the noble purpose of bringing about a national regeneration, of establishing the true German ideal. When the culminating form of its external manifestation, i. e. national unity, had been attained, profounder minds discovered with alarm that its true content of thought and feeling was endangered by materialistic tendencies. And as it is the poetry of a people which embodies the national ideal, Scherer, filled with the conviction of poetry's great mission, concluded that a renewed study of the epic and lyric history of the nation would contribute to save and to perpetuate the German ideal. Thus we see him turning aside from purely linguistic studies, in order to investigate independently the vast field of German literature, and to add his own results to whatever of great and of valuable had been accomplished by his predecessors. And while he still adheres to the principles and methods to which reference has been made above, it appears to us as if these had now assumed a more spiritual character, a transformation the causes of which

cannot here be discussed. A number of important monographs, and finally his excellent 'History of German Literature' (cf. MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES for May and June, 1886) were the fruit of his striving toward that high ideal which he himself characterizes in one of the closing sentences of his history of German literature: "Nur aus der ganzen Fülle der Epochen unserer Geschichte erkennen wir die Anlagen, die in uns ruhen; und nur in der gleichmässigen Ausbildung aller würde die Vollendung unseres Wesens bestehen."

The success of Scherer's writings, which even in the ease and elegance of their external form are penetrated by their author's earnest personality and bear abundant witness to his intimate *rapport* with the spirit of his time, was proof sufficient that he was fully appreciated by the best of his contemporaries. But to see the perfect realization of his ideal was not vouchsafed to him, for the glowing zeal of unremitting labors all too early consumed his energetic life. None the less will the heroic and inspiring example which shone through a personal realization of his own ideals, continue ever to abide with his admiring followers. And while, like Elisha, longing that his mantle may fall upon us, there comes instinctively to our minds the epitaph which adorns only the grave of the greatest:

VOLUIT. QUIESCIT.

JULIUS GOEBEL.

NOTES ON

Specimens of Early English. Edited by the
REV. RICHARD MORRIS, LL.D., Part I.
Second Edition, Oxford, 1885.

II.

In No. 5 of this journal, I made a few critical remarks on the specimens of the above-named volume illustrating the Midland dialect. I now take up the specimens of the Southern dialect. First a few general remarks. The book would have been rendered more useful if the grammatical introduction, which is based mainly on the Southern dialect, had taken account of the Midland dialect as well, since about half of the specimens are in the latter dialect. For instance, a clear statement of the

different use of the definite article and demonstrative adjective in the two dialects would have been valuable. In his *Old and Middle English*, p. 212, Mr. Oliphant says, "Ormin uses *that* as a Demonstrative and not as a Neuter Article," and Dr. Morris implies the same in his *Introd. to Genesis and Exodus*, p. XVI, where he says that "*Gen. and Ex.* and *A Bestiary* agree with the *Ormulum* in the employment of an uninflected article, and in the use of *ðat* (that) as a demonstrative adjective, and not as the neuter of the article." Both these statements are wrong. It is true that the most common form of the definite article in the *Ormulum*, etc., as in Early English generally, and especially in the Midland dialect, is the uninflected *þe*; but any number of instances can be given from the *Ormulum* and other Midland monuments where *þat* (*þatt*, *ðat*, etc., pl. *þa*) is used as the simple article (for all genders), though it is more commonly the demonstrative adjective. A few instances of its use as the article may be given: V, 964, 982, 996, 1000, 1031, 1034, etc.; XII, 37, 74; XV, 1960, 1974, 2084, 2115, etc., etc. The gram. introd. might have been made a little more complete in paradigms. The indefinite article, for instance, is not mentioned at all, nor the dual of the personal pronoun, though several forms occur in the texts, for example: *unk* (XVI, 1733), *unker* (XVI, 151, 1689, 1782-3), *inc* (VIII, A 113, B 139), *incker* (VII, 209). The personal pronoun of the first person has also the form *ihc* (common in *King Horn*); the forms *i*, *ic* are common also in the Southern dialect. The second pers. pl. has also the forms (nom.) *gīe*, *geō*; (gen.) *gīure*, *geur*, *ower*; (dat.) *gēu*, *giu*, *eou*, *eu*; (acc.) *gēu*, *giu*, *gu*. Third pers. sing. masc.: (nom.) *hi*, *hie*, *heo*; (gen.) *is*, *es*; (acc.) *hin*. Feminine: (nom.) *ha*, *hye*, *she*, *scæ*; (gen. dat.) *hure*; (acc.) *heo*. Plural: (nom.) *he*, *hie*, *hy*, *ha*, *þeȝȝ*; (gen.) *hore*, *þeȝȝre*; (dat.) *þan*, *þeȝȝm*. To the definite article add the forms: (nom. sing. masc.) *þa*, *se*; (gen.) *þas*, *þa*; (dat.) *þa*, *þam*, *þane*, *þon*, *þo*; (acc.) *þa*; (nom. fem.) *si*, *þe*; (dat.) *þer*, *þo*; (acc.) *þa*, *þeo*, *pie*; (dat. neut.) *þon*, *þam*; (acc.) *þæ*, *þo*; (nom. pl.) *þeo*; (dat.) *þa*, *þam*, *þeo*, *þo*, *þon*; the acc. pl. is not *þan*, but is = the nom. To the demonstrative adj. *þis* add the forms: (dat. sing. masc.) *þese*,